

## **Appendix F: Transcript of Public Scoping Meeting - Sacramento, California, January 8, 2002**

Scoping Meeting  
North-of-the-Delta  
Offstream Storage

\\_\_\_\_\_ /

---oOo---

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2002

1:00 P.M.

---oOo---

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Tuesday, January 8, 2002, commencing at the hour of 1:00, P.M. at Bonderson Building Hearing Room, 901 P Street Sacramento, California, before me, CINDY M. BILLALON, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the county of Sacramento, state of California, the following proceedings were taken down by me:

---oOo---

MS. BUCHHOLZ: We are here for the scoping meeting, the first meeting this year for North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage. My name is Gwen Buchholz; I'm your facilitator today; my job is crowd control for if you guys get unruly or something. What I'd like to do is just introduce some people here today.

I'd like to introduce up here we have representative Donna Garcia. A representative of the Department of Water Resources, Sean Sou, B.G. Heiland, Steve Roberts and then Scott Woodland, whose name is in our NOP and NOI and we'll talk about all of that a little later in the day. I'd like to introduce Assemblyman Dick Dickerson who is the first to start our program off today.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKERSON: Let me open by saying I'm extremely pleased to be here. This is a process that I think has been slow to work up to, but we're getting there and this is a very important step in the process and I want to thank you all for coming. And I want to welcome you to this extremely important scoping meeting on offstream storage North-of-the-Delta.

As you know, California with the population nearing 35 million has not had significant infrastructuring changes in its water system for nearly 40 years. At the urging of the Legislature, the Governor and the Secretary of the Bureau, the CALFED Record of Decision included integrated storage investigations to consider ground water and surface alternatives. The Department of Water Resources in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has for several years been conducting preliminary investigations into the possibility of increasing our surface ground water and surface storage capacity to help solve the water needs for agriculture, the Delta, the ecosystem and domestic water use for our growing population. Today they are asking for your views on the issues, benefits and future impacts with or without storage that they should consider as they proceed with the plan. Formal planning now begins and your feedback today will be a key to future decision.

Well, again, I am pleased to be here. I hope you're pleased to be here and I know the department is looking forward with eager anticipation to your comments and your input as we all work together to solve a very serious problem in the state of California. So thank you ladies and gentlemen for your interest in being here today and keep up your commitment and I think we'll get through this sooner or later. Thank you very much.

MS. BUCHHOLZ: Thank you, Assemblyman Dickerson. We also have with us today Assemblyman Aanestad and I would like to have him make a few comments too.

ASSEMBLYMAN AANESTAD: Well, just very briefly I just want to tell you that the project has the support of our office as a much needed and much delayed resource for Northern California. What was striking to me in looking at the history of all of this was that it was nearly nine years ago when the idea of a Sites Reservoir was first proposed and it's taken nine years to get to the point where we're now in a formal environmental review process. Why it's taken that long I don't know the answer to that, but I do know that it's taken too long because in that period of time this state has grown by almost 10 million people and the demand for water in this state is going to increase with time as we proceed on and on and we cannot go on in the fashion of we're just looking forward, but we're doing nothing about it.

What's heartening about this meeting is it's really a kick off to doing something about the environmental review process that we have in California and I know that the year 2004 is supposed to be the year when the process ends and we actually get down to building the new water storage in the state of California. Sites is probably the one that is most ready to go, but it's not the only one that's needed and I'm hoping that during this process there's going to be some mention of other offstream or even onstream sites for water storage for Northern California.

Assemblyman Dickerson gave you all the reasons why we need more instreams in water storage as far as agricultural, as far as the fisheries, as far as the environment problems and the growing need by the population in the urban and developing areas, but suffice it to say we've waited long enough and that's why I'm happy to see you folks here and beginning this process that is long overdue. Certainly my office stands in support in any way possible that we can help with making this more expedient and trying to solve any problems that might come along. Good luck in this meeting today and please contact my office if you have any questions or suggestions for how we can expedite this process. Thank you.

MS. BUCHHOLZ: Thank you, Assemblyman Aanestad.

We want to go over a little bit about the purpose of this meeting today and the outline of today's agenda. And the purpose of this meeting is to notify all of you and interested parties about the intent as ascribed in the Notice of Intent and the Notice of Preparation; that was public and we actually have copies of these here for anybody who is interested and did not get those when they were in the publications.

This is for North-of-the-Delta – of North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage; it is a joint project between the Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. One of the purposes of this meeting is to develop and identify ideas for alternatives so as we proceed into the environmental impact report, environmental impact statement that the ranges of alternatives that are identified at this time can be incorporated into the considerations as those documentations [documents] are prepared.

Another purpose of this meeting is to identify issues that need to be evaluated and questions that need to be answered through the environmental documentation for the purpose of the project. And finally, the purpose of the meeting is to obtain information. We hope that all of you have signed in on the mailing list so we can continue to keep you informed as this process continues. We also -- I want to point out that we have comment cards here and that if you have comments and written comments today you can submit them on these cards or you can submit them in writing at the end of the comment period, which is January 25th.

What we're going to do is Sean Sou is going to present a very short summary of some of the things that are being covered, specifically NOP, Notice of preparation and NOI, Notice of Intent. And then we would like to hold questions so we can capture your comments and questions as part of our scoping process, all of the comments and questions. We have three scoping meetings, today here in Sacramento, tomorrow in Maxwell and the next one in Fresno. We will be taking all of those comments plus the written comments we receive and putting them together in a scoping report; the scoping report will discuss those comments and it will also include copies of the transcript that we are transcribing today.

So, again, if you could hold your comments so we can capture them appropriately and they can be utilized in our documentation, that would be the most appropriate thing. So at this time, Sean, would you proceed with the presentation?

MR. SOU: Thank you. Thank you, Gwen. And good afternoon everyone.

Okay. I'd like to introduce North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage. In order to introduce the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage, I'm going to describe the North-of-the-Delta offstream storage, the Sacramento region and Sacramento River, the CALFED program, the proposed North-of-the-Delta offstream storage and the flexibility provided by such a storage, the Planning Partnership for North-of-the-Delta offstream storage and the environmental

documentation processes. And finally opportunities for you the public and agencies' participation.

The water resources of the Sacramento River region support 2.2 million people and associated industries, over two million acres of farmland, 200,000 acres of marsh and agricultural land for water 60 percent of the total duck and goose population in the Pacific flyway and flows for riverine habitat and the total water needs are projected to increase in the future, that's the bottom line. The Sacramento River region as shown in this picture here covers an area basically of the entire Sacramento River drainage area. It extends 300 miles from the Oregon border in the north to the south of the Delta area. At the same time the Sacramento River and its tributaries make up the largest and most important riverine ecosystem in California; these factors combined have brought us a number of challenges facing the region, particularly the Sacramento River region. And these factors include water users are subject to shortages in both average and drought years. A number of species depending on the riverine ecosystem are being designated as threatened and/or endangered species.

The Sacramento River provides 80 percent of the Delta inflow and the inflow is supporting the Delta ecosystem as well as Delta diversions. These often competing demands on this limited water resource has brought us to the point where operation and management of the system are becoming increasingly inflexible due to several reasons: Due to increase of water use within the region, due to Delta diversions and exports and increase of recognition of environmental needs. Meanwhile, in May 1995 CALFED began to develop a long-term comprehensive plan to restore ecological health and improve water management of the Bay Delta system. The CALFED program effort included representatives of agricultural, urban, environmental, business interests and tribal interests and other local interests. And the CALFED program effort is coordinated with emphasis on regional solutions. In the summer of 2000 CALFED published a programmatic EIS and EIR and a Record of Decision with an action specific long-term plan. The CALFED solution area covers six regions including the Sacramento River region, our area of interest. CALFED also developed four program objectives and the objectives are: To improve water supply reliability; to improve ecosystem quality; to improve water quality for beneficial uses and to reduce risks associated with catastrophic breaching of Delta levees.

To achieve these objectives, CALFED included eight problem elements as shown here (indicating). Our focus is the storage component, although many of the other elements will be effected by North-of-the-Delta offstream storage. In the CALFED Report of Decision CALFED concluded that storage can help to achieve CALFED objectives, more specifically that storage is critical to the successful implementation of all aspects of the CALFED program and that storage provides much needed system flexibility. The Record of Decision identifies Sites Reservoir in North-of-the-Delta as one of five surface storage projects statewide for continued evaluation. And in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the California Environmental Water Quality, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage will evaluate Sites Reservoir and a reasonable range of alternatives.

Concurrent with the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage, these are some of the ongoing projects in the Sacramento Valley, including Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement (Phase 8 Settlement Agreement.) Sacramento Valley Basinwide Management Plan, CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program, Sacramento River Conservation Area (SB1086), Sacramento/San Joaquin River Basin Comprehensive Study and other CALFED stage one surface and ground water actions.

Included in the Record of Decision are specific objectives for a North-of-the-Delta offstream storage; those objectives include enhance water management flexibility in the Sacramento Valley, reduce water diversions from the Sacramento River during critical fish migration periods, increase reliability of supply for a major portion of Sacramento Valley, and to provide storage and operational benefits for other CALFED programs including Delta Water Quality and the Environmental Water Account.

In order to better understand how North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage would effect the current system and how North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage objectives will be accomplished, it is helpful to do a comparison of the existing system with and without North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage. This here is a simplified graphic showing the existing system with a number of important water resource facilities, including Shasta Reservoir, Oroville Reservoir and Folsom Reservoir plus the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta area. In the next slides we will focus in on this Northern Sacramento Valley area.

This is a slide showing the current situation without an offstream storage project in the wintertime and focusing on the two major Sacramento River users. The Tehama-Colusa and Glenn-Colusa irrigation District canal. In the wintertime when flows in the river are relatively high as depicted by this thicker line representing the river, (indicating). Diversions into the canals are relatively low as indicated by the thinner lines representing the canals. Again, the operation without an offstream storage in the summertime now there's a large agricultural demand in these two water service areas and so diversion into canals are relatively high while the flow in the river is relatively low.

Now with an offstream storage during the wintertime, when the flows in the river are relatively high, we can divert water into an offstream storage from either the Sacramento River and/or its tributaries. This bucket here represents any type of storage (indicating). Now the operation with an offstream storage during the summertime when the demands are high in the service area with water storage in an offstream storage, we have an alternative source of water for these users. With water stored in an offstream storage, we can provide water to these two canals from an offstream storage. Also with an offstream storage we can improve the water supply reliability for these water users and at the same time reduce diversions from the Sacramento River during critical fish migration periods.

Now let's look back at the larger system with an offstream storage. Preliminary operation studies indicate that with an offstream storage the current operation with an offstream storage can provide much needed system flexibility. And in fact with an offstream storage if water can be provided from offstream, we can improve the storage in Shasta Reservoir, Oroville Reservoir, as well as Folsom Reservoir. Also with water stored in offstream storage during the winter, the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage Program will improve locally managed ground water storage as well. And also with an offstream storage we can improve benefits for other CALFED programs, including Delta Water Quality and the Environmental Water Account.

In summary, the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage Program will provide an opportunity for a balance solution with ecosystem benefits, environmental water use, agricultural water use, municipal water use and industrial water use.

The Record of Decision identified major steps or milestones associated with the North of Delta Offstream Storage. Step one is create local Planning Partnership with water entities. And step two is to complete the environmental review and planning documentation by August 2004.

For the first step we have a Memorandum of Understanding with local partnerships initially signed in November of 2000 and subsequently other local water entities have signed to this Memorandum of Understanding. Currently we have 11 local water signatories to MOU and five CALFED agencies, including three federal agencies and two state agencies. The two federal agencies include the Bureau of Reclamation, which is a federal lead agency for complying with the National Environmental Policy Act and the state agencies include the Department of Water Resources, which is a state lead agency for complying with the California Environmental Quality Act.

For step two the Department of Water Resources and the Bureau of Reclamation and Planning Partnership plan to prepare a site specific EIS which will be based on the CALFED final programmatic EIS/EIR. One other major planning effort being concurrently developed is the engineering feasibility studies. The Notice of Preparation, Notice of Intent are the first

formal processes in this environmental documentation process for the North of Delta Offstream Storage Program. A NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse November of 2001 and Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register in November of 2001 as well. Included in the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent are a list of possible project alternatives included in the project's present condition: No action, future condition, a Sites Reservoir alternative, the Newville Reservoir alternative, other possible alternatives at this time include enlarging Shasta and other alternatives developed from the scoping process.

As part of the scoping process this is where your comments can be most helpful to us. Specifically we're asking are there other additional North-of-the-Delta alternatives that we should be considering in our evaluation? Are there other possible effects associated with the alternatives that we should be considering in our evaluation? So we'll be asking for those comments later on.

The next phase of this formal environmental process is the scoping meetings. The purpose of scoping meetings is to allow or provide the public and agencies an opportunity to provide comments on the possible alternatives and their effects on the project. The three geographic scopes we have scheduled including the one here today in Sacramento and the other two are in Maxwell and Fresno. After the scoping meeting and the scoping period ends we will be preparing a written report to summarize the comments and alternatives to be carried forward; at that time the Department and the Planning Partnership will begin writing the EIR and EIS. So please send your comments to us by January 25th and comment on the alternatives that we have outlined earlier plus any additional alternatives you might want us to consider. There will be opportunities for public involvement, regular opportunities at meetings during the documentation process for the North of Delta Offstream Storage project.

Finally, by attending the scoping meeting you can send your comments either at the scoping meetings or to our staff. Scott Woodland, who is in the back of the room here, will be the person to receive your comments; his business cards are in the back of the room if you want to pick one up. We ask you to send comments through either fax or mail, through the mail, regular mail. Okay. Thank you.

I'll hand it back to Gwen.

MS. BUCHHOLZ: Thank you, Sean.

That concludes the presentation part of our meeting today and today we'd like to open it up for comments; however, we are asking that for all of the people who want to speak that you fill out a speaker's card and Jim Wieking will be picking those up; you guys can put them up in the air. I'm hoping there's some comments here. We are also asking that you come up to the podium so that we can help record it better. We also are recording it through a stenographer today so we're asking you to please present your name and your affiliation, speak clearly and slowly so she can pick it up, although I'm sure she's very good. We will be putting them up on the board and recording them electronically too through a process and we will try to capture what you're presenting and your comments.

And as I said, again, all of the comments that we receive we will be including in our final scoping report. So at this time I have one speaker's card. Are there any other speaker's cards? Okay. If we can start with this, if we can go to -- I'm putting them here in the order I've got them. Charles Casey from Friends of the River.

MR. CASEY: Thank you very much.

I'll make my comments fairly brief because we'll be submitting by the due date some written comments which are obviously a little easier to work with.

But the main thing Friends of the River, which is a statewide river conservation group, is concerned about is the impacts related to the diversions necessary to fill this offstream storage. We are certainly happy that the Department of Water Conservation and Bureau of

Reclamation are considering sites that will not impact directly a beautiful river canyon -- which is historically one of the traditions of damming projects -- but nonetheless, offstream storage still poses some potentially great impacts that has to do mainly with the diversions from the Sacramento River. It has been estimated that 5,000 cubic feet per second would be needed to divert to the Site storage project at the Sacramento River system. We don't need to remind folks that the ecosystem remains relatively healthy here as opposed to the San Joaquin where up to 80 percent of the river is already diverted. The Sacramento River, according to CALFED diagnoses, diversions have reduced history flows by approximately 35 percent. We're concerned that the additional diversions for Sites could certainly exacerbate that type -- those type of impacts. And don't forget the consequence of this certainly is the Sacramento River still sustains all five native runs of salmon and steelhead, although several of these runs are in decline and threatened; it also supports a habitat utilized by sensitive threatened terrestrial species. So, again, diversion and impacts to the Sacramento River could create some real problems and those type of impacts need to be addressed and accounted for both as a cumulative result of diversions and also in terms of just diversions themselves. We were concerned where the water is going and what it would be used for, who needs it and I think the alternatives that certainly need to be considered are the amount of money to be spent for Sites Reservoir versus how that money might well be spent for conservation and efficiency and perhaps offset the yields expected from the site. So certainly the yields expected from Sites are very critical, but how can you also utilize those water yields in other ways, the amount of money expenditures necessary for construction of this company perhaps would be directed something more water friendly and something that is reasonable for water yield. So that's my brief comments. We certainly have very serious concerns about the diversions and about the lack of good alternatives and we would like to see that detailed further; as you go forward we'll be making much more detailed comments by your due date. Thank you very much.

MS. BUCHHOLZ: Mr. John Mills, the Regional Counsel of Rural Counties.

MR. MILLS: Thank you. I want to thank Assemblyman Dickerson for hosting this meeting. I appreciate the opportunity to give you some input on scoping on this documentation. My clients which are 29 of the 50 state counties located in the north part of the state is easily described as the counties with the water and without the people; I would like to keep it that way. Generally speaking, I would like to address my comments about impacts in the context of both local and regional. And by that I mean that we not just talk about Sites, but specifically regional impacts.

By regional I would argue that they include both Sacramento watershed and the Delta and if we step back and look at some of the holes in the CALFED programs, which are currently the subject of litigation by my clients, I think you may want to patch those holes before you sail ahead in such a leaky vessel. First I would ask specifically how would the reservoir be owned and managed, specifically by what parties and through what specific mechanisms? This needs to be made clear in the beginning and not an amorphous group who may or may not come in and out of membership. Second what about the size, location and operational characterization, if any, of diversion facilities? These need to be very specific and not general and I agree with the notion of scaling the backside of the hydrograph in the Sacramento River in wet years and parking for use in dry years. And generally speaking our organization supports new we have seen far too many proposals for facilities that weren't well thought out and the management assurances were not well defined and what ended up being located in our counties were very wet deserts and by that I mean large bodies of water in which people who live in the area have no access to unless they want to go fishing; God help them if they take a bucket of water home to use it.

Next I would ask that we identify early in this process through the environmental document if there are local -- by that I mean within the county or counties which the project is located -- specific benefits derived through affordable, reliable water supplies. Specific answers to each are necessary, not generalities. I also want to point out that most of these areas are agricultural in nature and water which becomes too expensive precludes local idealizations.



I would like to have the document clearly identify what linkage there is directly or indirectly to water exports in the bay Delta and/or the CALFED water acquisition programs which EWA is interested. And the idea that Sites would be helpful to EWA I find inconsistent with CALFED'S own document Environmental Water Account program which was set in four years from its implementation, Sites wouldn't even be built by then. I think we need to identify which is going to subsidize the EWA or not. We also need to make it clear what the EWA is, it's a backfilling of water supplies or environment which is not functional in the Environmental Water Account. I would like to understand very clearly on behalf of my client's what entity would own the land necessary for the facility; I don't mean what's under water and those surrounding lands, what specific mechanism would take more local physical impacts.

One of the partnerships on your screen is Colusa County and I want to point out at one point the federal government was in the rears in failing to pay their in use tax fees of over \$800,000. So one of the things that Congress is not for is appropriating land to acquire things and then failing to appropriate the money to pay the fees. If we're going to obtain any other land in the Sacramento area it would be nice if state and federal governments would be current on their taxes as we ask all of our other citizens to be. What relationship, if any, is going to exist between the water resources which are necessary for this facility and those which are needed desperately now for the Trinity River Restoration Program Division? We cannot use the same water in different watersheds twice and there's water right now in the Sacramento River which rightfully belongs in the Trinity Basin and it's not being delivered there and we're going to count on additional water coming out of this stream; we want to make sure it's not the same water at some point we're going to need back in the Trinity Basin.

We also need to make sure of the relationship, if any, between the water resources necessary for this facility and those water resources that are needed for previously authorized federal surface storage projects; absent funding those projects are in some cases nearly ready to go. I would ask that we make clear on the document what the applicability is in this facility in this operation to California existing statutes, watershed origin, area of origin and protected areas. These are questions which would in any event have to be answered for the State Water Resources Control Board; we need to make it very clear. I will be submitting all this in writing as well for the record.

What the new flexibility generated by this new offstream storage would be to other reservoirs and in that benefit the flexibilities because I agree that the California water system desperately needs increased flexibility; my concern is what parties would specifically accrue the benefits achieved by that new flexibility. Many of these facilities, in fact all of these facilities you mentioned, located within my client's membership area and we would be interested to know if the water in the new facility was going to be used there or in the LA Basin. We would like to know specifically what the potential Bay Delta Water Quality impacts will be as a result of these diversions or will there be benefits? If there are benefits -- and I believe there could be under the right circumstances -- for a new facility that would be wonderful, but we need to classify that, but we need to do benefits in the context of what CALFED says they're going to do in stage one, which is ratchet exports out of the Delta by increased pumping. Are we going to have better quality water in stage one in CALFED with this new facility or will we be where we are now or less?

So, see, what I'm saying is we need to balance the equation on both sides. If in fact there are going to be impacts then we need to identify clearly now the water impacts in the Delta that have resulted in increased exports in anything, new storage facilities that would be mitigated and specifically which parties would be liable for those impacts. I realize the state board is still wrestling with this in phase eight, believe me, this is ground zero for phase eight. This is the Sacramento Valley so we can't put this off. Again, I am submitting this in writing; I want to thank you again for the opportunity scoping. We look forward to seeing this in the draft document. Thank you.

MS. BUCHHOLZ: Paul Olmstead from Sacramento Municipal Utilities District.

MR. OLMSTEAD: Thank you. I want to state first of all that this process is finally going forward to support the process as its coming forward. I'd also like to support Mr. Mills' previous comments; I'm going to focus my comments away from what he has previously stated. SMUD is here representing not only the CVP power customers, in other words, people who are beneficial of industrial power and also pays pump. The one thing that wasn't mentioned today in today's comments is the purpose and need for this project; the purpose and need is not well defined. We have yet to see a defined purpose and need specifically for the Sites project and the larger context of the North Sacramento offstream storage facilities. We would like to see some agreement on where we're proceeding with this stuff. This documentation goes so far down the row we can't compute. Stakeholders get a chance to view the purpose and need before this documentation goes out on the street. We support the need for new storage -- there is a need for storage, no question about it -- we'd particularly like to support the Shasta enlargement, from our standpoint that's best. We would also support the Sites Reservoir with one exception, that as well as the people who will benefit from the project bring power to the table so the pumping needs, that is the power they use to pump the water out of the river into the reservoir, is brought on the table and paid for by the beneficiaries. We don't think CVP power users should pick up the tab for that part of the project. I'd like to make that point very clear.

We are also concerned if Sites will okay integrated features. Integrated features of the Central Valley project, that so far is undefined. We would like to assure that that is discussed in detail with any cost benefit ratios associated with that so we can compare it with the other features of the Central Valley program. Specifically in regard to cost benefit ratio we would like to see something that shows the costs and benefits of Sites in relation to the other alternatives such as Shasta enlargement and independently compare it one-on-one so we can look at each one independently and make some separate evaluations for capacity benefit perspective and the decision making process by which this is going to go through is kind of somewhat undefined.

In looking back at the Record of Decision, I believe it stated something like there's going to be environmental evaluation on both the sides at issue to other facilities, other alternatives before it went through the official CALFED budget process. Sites is so far ahead of the game than everyone else we want to make sure this process is well defined so people understand that everything is prepared equally before the final decision is made. I'm going to focus my decisions at that point. We agree there's a need for operational flexibility in this system. We've got to make sure whatever decision is made both water using, power using, agricultural and municipal parties are kept whole from the entire power. And ending with in keeping with the comment of Mr. Mills when he spoke of the future, address the linkage as far as this effects every other party, potential effecting party stakeholder in the Central Valley. The most important part to the state here is we believe there should be no redirected impacts in CALFED'S philosophy, from this point on that the impacts are to be borne by these people who are beneficiaries of that project.

We would like to end with that. I will be sending some detailed comments by the 25th. Thank you.

MS. BUCHHOLZ: Mr. Jeff Phipps. State your affiliation, please.

MR. PHIPPS: Good afternoon. I'm an independent consultant working generally on behalf of CVP Power Community. Three or four comments more generic to the process. I think some of the comments that Paul and John made specifically apply as well, but more generic is the EIS process. The presentation today was rather vague on when our opportunities for comments would be solicited; when we would have a chance to provide those comments. We need more specifics. At this point I don't know if I'm going to be able to comment before we have a final draft document or at what detail. We would very much like to have impact on the purpose need statement, the Notice Action, what's included in the Notice Action, the alternative evaluation, the level of detail, et cetera. So we need a more specific outline of the opportunities for comment on the process. Second thing is the no action, very critical baseline by which we compare. John brought up Trinity. There's the

south of the Delta storage, there's the in Delta storage facilities. How is the system? How valuable is this project? Is it dependant on the baseline that you compare against? So we need to have a significant discussion of what's included and what's not included in the No Action. The third thing has to do with CALFED solution principles. It wasn't mentioned, but it's a very important concept that has been promoted and included in the Order of Decision so each alternative in its evaluation should be compared specifically on how it's going to respond and achieve the CALFED solution principles. Specifically the ones that my community is most interested in is no reflected impacts as Paul mentioned, also beneficiary pay, concepts of solutions. Beneficiaries of this project will be able to respond appropriately to fund this type of project. I look forward to the discussion. Thank you.

MS. BUCHHOLZ: Are there any more speakers that would like to speak today with comments? We have no more cards at this time. With that we thank you for attending. We will, again, encourage you if you didn't get the chance when you came to sign up because that will become part of our mailing list and we will be putting the scoping report together; that will be available for those who signed up. Thank you.

(Proceedings were concluded at 1:48 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

I, CINDY M. BILLALON, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, licensed by the state of California and empowered to administer oaths and affirmations pursuant to Section 2093 (b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, do hereby certify:

That the said proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed under my direction via computer-assisted transcription; That the foregoing transcript is a true record of the proceedings which then and there took place; That I am a disinterested person to said action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on February 4, 2002.

---

CINDY M. BILLALON